

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 9-14 remain before the Examiner. Claim 15 has been added. The Applicant notes that claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 9-14 presently stand rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6, 233, 232 to Chau et al. (hereinafter “Chau”) and notes Examiner’s issues addressed as “dynamic bonding” and the definition of first and second “protocol.”

The applicant respectfully submits that the present invention as claimed has an activated media driver preferably triggering the generic forwarding interface (GFI) processing to activate a port interface (PIF) module that determines the layer two protocol to be used for the session based on the connection type with the GFI binding or otherwise linking the determined layer two protocol to the layer one interface of the receiving media port for the duration of the session. After the session has ended, the PIF is made inactive. Then, this same media driver can be reactivated by a subsequent communication that preferably triggers the GFI processing to reactivate the PIF module which in turn determines the layer two protocol to be used for the subsequent session based on the connection type with the GFI binding or otherwise linking the determined layer two protocol to the layer one interface of the receiving port for the duration of the session. Accordingly, the present invention, as claimed, *on a session-by-session basis*, i.e., dynamically, binds or otherwise links the layer two protocol appropriate for the incoming communication to the layer one interface receiving the communication.

The single network access server (NAS) of Chau receives client communications via ports dedicated to telephone lines where there is no suggestion of an apparatus or process that has, on a session-by-session, a layer two protocol being determined based on the communication type and then the linking of the determined layer two protocol to the layer one interface of the receiving port.

Appl. No. 09/511,955
Amdt. Dated November 25, 2003
Reply to Office action mailed August 29, 2003

In view of the above amendments, arguments and remarks, consideration and favorable action on Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 9-14 and 15 are respectfully requested. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Should any question remain in view of his communication, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned so that a prompt disposition of this application can be achieved.

The total number of claims before the Examiner remain less than twenty-one. The addition of independent Claim 15 adds an additional independent claim over three requiring an additional fee of \$86 be added to the RCE filing fee of \$770 yielding a total fee of \$856. Authorization is hereby given to charge any additional fees, and credit any overcharges pertaining to the prosecution of this matter to Deposit Account No. **02-3979**.

Respectfully submitted,



Dr. Michael B. Brooks, Esq.
Registration Number 39,921

Telephone No. (818) 225-2920
FAX (818) 225-1569

Michael Blaine Brooks, P.C.
5010 N. Pkwy Calabasas, Suite 104
Calabasas, CA 91302-3913